

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

- [Home](#)
- [Resources](#)
- [Contact](#)
- [Missouri Report](#)
- [Institutional Report](#)
- [Logout](#)

Missouri's First Year Educator Survey

University of Missouri-Kansas City Report

Survey:

- Teacher Teacher's Principal
- Principal Principal's Supervisor
- Counselor Counselor's Supervisor

Beginning school year:

2018

Ending school year:

2019

Include Open-Ended Questions

* Rows are displayed if there is a minimum of 15 respondents. However, actual counts are not displayed.

Question / Standard	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Mean	StdDev
Standard 1 - Content Knowledge						4.22	0.60
1. The teacher was prepared to incorporate interdisciplinary instruction.	0%	7%	12%	61%	20%	3.93	0.78
2. The teacher was prepared in his or her content area	0%	0%	5%	54%	41%	4.37	0.57
3. The teacher was was prepared to engage students in his or her content area.	0%	2%	5%	46%	46%	4.37	0.69
4. The teacher was prepared to make content meaningful to students.	0%	5%	10%	44%	41%	4.22	0.81
Standard 2 - Learning, Growth, and Development						3.81	0.81
5. The teacher was prepared to design lessons that include differentiated instruction.	0%	12%	12%	51%	24%	3.88	0.92
6. The teacher was prepared to implement instruction based on a student's IEP.	0%	12%	20%	46%	22%	3.78	0.92
7. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for English language learners.	0%	7%	29%	44%	20%	3.76	0.85

8. The teacher was prepared to modify instruction for gifted learners.	0%	12%	29%	37%	22%	3.68	0.95
9. The teacher was prepared to create lesson plans to engage all learners.	0%	12%	12%	41%	34%	3.98	0.97
Standard 3 - Curriculum Implementation						4.02	0.90
10. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons based on curriculum standards.	0%	10%	7%	41%	41%	4.15	0.93
11. The teacher was prepared to deliver lessons for diverse learners.	2%	10%	12%	46%	29%	3.90	1.01
Standard 4 - Critical Thinking						4.02	0.72
12. The teacher was prepared to implement a variety of instructional strategies.	0%	5%	12%	59%	24%	4.02	0.75
13. The teacher was prepared to engage students in critical thinking.	0%	5%	15%	56%	24%	4	0.77
14. The teacher was prepared to model critical thinking and problem solving.	0%	5%	15%	54%	27%	4.02	0.78
Standard - N/A							
15. The teacher was prepared to use technology to enhance student learning.	0%	2%	15%	46%	37%	4.17	0.76
Standard 5 - Positive Classroom Environment						4.05	0.70
16. The teacher was prepared to create a classroom environment that encourages student engagement.	0%	10%	10%	49%	32%	4.02	0.90
17. The teacher was prepared to use a variety of classroom management strategies.	0%	10%	7%	56%	27%	4	0.86
18. The teacher was prepared to manage a variety of discipline issues.	0%	10%	15%	56%	20%	3.85	0.84
19. The teacher was prepared to motivate his or her students to learn.	0%	5%	7%	61%	27%	4.10	0.73
20. The teacher was prepared to keep his or her students on task.	0%	7%	5%	63%	24%	4.05	0.76
21. The teacher was prepared to foster positive student relationships.	0%	2%	2%	63%	32%	4.24	0.62
22. The teacher was prepared to facilitate smooth transitions for his or her students.	0%	7%	5%	61%	27%	4.07	0.78
Standard 6 - Effective Communication						4.11	0.59
23. The teacher was prepared to use effective communication strategies to foster learning.	0%	2%	5%	68%	24%	4.15	0.61
24. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with parents.	0%	2%	15%	59%	24%	4.05	0.70
25. The teacher was prepared to effectively communicate with all staff.	0%	5%	12%	51%	32%	4.10	0.79
26. The teacher was prepared to promote respect for diverse cultures, genders, and intellectual / physical abilities.	0%	0%	15%	61%	24%	4.10	0.62
27. The teacher was prepared to use technology as a communication tool.	0%	2%	5%	71%	22%	4.12	0.59
28. The teacher was prepared to enhance students' skills in using technology as a communication tool.	0%	2%	7%	66%	24%	4.12	0.63

Standard 7 - Student Assessment and Data Analysis						4.01	0.74
29. The teacher was prepared to use assessments to evaluate learning.	0%	7%	5%	63%	24%	4.05	0.76
30. The teacher was prepared to develop assessments to evaluate learning.	0%	7%	5%	61%	27%	4.07	0.78
31. The teacher was prepared to analyze assessment data to improve instruction.	0%	10%	10%	54%	27%	3.98	0.87
32. The teacher was prepared to help students set learning goals based on assessment results.	0%	7%	15%	59%	20%	3.90	0.79
33. The teacher was prepared to work with colleagues to set learning goals using assessment results.	0%	7%	12%	49%	32%	4.05	0.85
Standard 8 - Professionalism						4.06	0.68
34. The teacher was prepared to analyze data to reflect on areas for professional growth.	0%	5%	10%	61%	24%	4.05	0.73
35. The teacher was prepared to reflect on his or her practices for professional growth.	0%	2%	12%	61%	24%	4.07	0.68
Standard 9 - Professional Collaboration						4.11	0.61
36. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with colleagues to support student learning.	0%	0%	5%	61%	34%	4.29	0.55
37. The teacher was prepared to collaborate with parents to support student learning.	0%	5%	12%	59%	24%	4.02	0.75
38. The teacher was prepared to participate in professional organizations.	0%	2%	17%	56%	24%	4.02	0.72

Question / Standard	Very Poor (1)	Poor (2)	Fair (3)	Good (4)	Very Good (5)	Mean	StdDev
---------------------	---------------	----------	----------	----------	---------------	------	--------

39. Please click on the response that best reflects your perspective about the overall quality of the professional education program your teacher completed.	0%	2%	20%	39%	39%	4.15	0.81
--	----	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------

Question / Standard	Ineffective (1)	Minimally Effective (2)	Effective (3)	Highly Effective (4)	Mean	StdDev
---------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	---------------	----------------------	------	--------

39b. Based upon the performance based evaluation of this first year teacher, how would you rate his/her impact upon students?	0%	12%	59%	29%	3.17	0.62
---	----	-----	-----	-----	------	------



If you have any problems, questions, or comments about this website, please direct your concerns to:

OSEDA Tech Support
 Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis
 University of Missouri - Columbia
muextosedats@umsystem.edu (573) 882-7396